REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, and 11-14 under §35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Van Maanen, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 4,855,580). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As recited in claim 11, the present invention is directed to a method for automatically integrating digital data obtained from the interaction between an image pickup apparatus (i.e.

"A method for automatically integrating digital data obtained from the interaction between an image pickup apparatus and a data-processing apparatus comprising: opening a file by said data-processing apparatus; .... saving automatically said second digital data into said file including said first digital data."

Van Maanen, Jr. does not teach or disclose opening a file by said data-processing apparatus (i.e. computer or personal digital assistant) and saving automatically said second digital data into said file including said first digital data. Van Maanan, Jr. only points out that the output of remote receiving device 16 represents the merged records in which the information captured by image camera 12 and OCR or MICR reader 14 are stored within a single record for each document processed by document processing system 10. Applicant disagrees with the comment that "remote receiving device 16 can be a PC or any computer [can be] equipped to perform these functions" by the Examiner, because "store and merge" by remote receiving device 16 is not equal to "open and save" by data-processing apparatus. A facsimile machine can store and merge records form two different data-captured devices to a single record, but not to open and save a file like a PC. Therefore, claims 1 and 11 are patentable over Van Maanen, Jr.

In fact, the object of remote receiving device 16 is used to calculate the elapsed time occurring between document records per data capture device and compares the inter-document time with each record by Van Maanen, Jr. If the inter-document times are within a predetermined range, the merge operation takes place. If the inter-document times are outside the predetermined range, the records received by the remote receiving device 16 do not correspond to the same document captured by image camera 12 and the information read by OCR or MICR reader 14 and therefore no merge takes place. So, the present invention is different from the invention of Van Maanen, Jr.

For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 11 along with the dependent claims 2-6, and 12-14 are distinguishable over the applied art, and are not disclosed or taught or suggested by the applied art and the anticipation rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 7-10 and 15-20 are rejected under §35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Maanen, Jr. in view of Schmid et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,659,164). Schmid et al. does not

overcome the deficiencies discussed above with respect to <u>Van Maanen, Jr</u>. Accordingly, the obviousness rejection should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing remarks is respectfully requested.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP

Kenneth M. Berner

Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: August 7, 2003
KMB/jd